MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION		
Requestor Name and Address: THOMASON GENERAL HOSPITAL PO BOX 16468 AUSTIN TX 78761-6468	MFDR Tracking #: M4-06-6854-01	
	DWC Claim #:	
	Injured Employee:	
Respondent Name and Box #:	Date of Injury:	
Texas Mutual Insurance Co. Box #: 54	Employer Name:	
	Insurance Carrier #:	

PART II: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY AND PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTATION

Requestor's Position Summary: "Carrier denied claim stating past filing deadline. Claim recv'd via Fax the day before filing deadline, but carrier said it was not legible."

Principal Documentation:

- 1. DWC 60 Package
- 2. Medical Bills
- 3. EOB
- 4. Total Amount Sought \$3,049.22

PART III: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY AND PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTATION

Respondent's Position Summary: "Texas Mutual received the initial bill which was returned as incomplete. A letter was sent to the requestor on 02/07/2006; informing them of the incomplete bill received and that the bill was not processed and is being returned for the following reason, 'billing is illegible.' (Exhibit 3) The requestor did not file their complete medical bill with carrier within the 95 day time-frame from the date of service; therefore, the requestor was not compliant with DWC Rule 134.801."

Principal Documentation:

1. Response Package

PART IV: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS				
Dates of Service	Denial Code	Disputed Service	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
10/28/2005-10/31/2005	731	Emergency Room Visit with Radiological Services	\$3,049.22	\$0.00
			Total Due:	\$0.00

PART V: REVIEW OF SUMMARY, METHODOLOGY AND EXPLANATION

Texas Labor Code §413.011(a-d), titled *Reimbursement Policies and Guidelines*, and Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, titled *Use of the Fee Guidelines*, effective May 16, 2002 set out the reimbursement guidelines.

This request for medical fee dispute resolution was received by the Division on June 29, 2006. Pursuant to Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, the Division notified the requestor on July 12, 2006 to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute as set forth in the rule.

- 1. For the services involved in this dispute, the respondent reduced or denied payment with reason code:
 - 731 134.801 PROVIDER SHALL NOT SUBMIT A MEDICAL BILL LATER THAN THE 95TH DAY AFTER THE DATE OF SERVICE. FOR SERVICES ON OR AFTER 9/1/05.
- 2. Texas Labor Code §408.027(a) requires that "A health care provider shall submit a claim for payment to the insurance carrier not later than the 95th day after the date on which the health care services are provided to the injured employee.

Failure by the health care provider to timely submit a claim for payment constitutes a forfeiture of the provider's right to reimbursement for that claim for payment."

- 3. Rule 102.4(h), titled *General Rules for Non-Commission Communication*, requires that "Unless the great weight of evidence indicates otherwise, written communications shall be deemed to have been sent on:
 - (1) the date received, if sent by fax, personal delivery or electronic transmission or.
 - (2) the date postmarked if sent by mail via United States Postal Service regular mail, or, if the postmark date is unavailable, the later of the signature date on the written communication or the date it was received minus five days. If the date received minus five days is a Sunday or legal holiday, the date deemed sent shall be the next previous day which is not a Sunday or legal holiday."
- 4. The requestor asserts in the rationale for increased reimbursement from the *Table of Disputed Services* that "Carrier denied claim stating past filing deadline. Claim recv'd via Fax the day before filing deadline, but carrier said it was not legible." Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds no documentation to support that the requestor submitted a claim for payment to the insurance carrier not later than the 95th day from the date the disputed services were provided to the injured employee. The Division therefore concludes that carrier reason code 731 is supported.
- 5. This dispute relates to emergency services with radiological studies provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rules at 28 TAC §134.401(a)(3) and (a)(5), effective August 1, 1997, 22 TexReg 6264, which state that such services are not covered by this guideline and shall be reimbursed at a fair and reasonable rate until the issuance of a fee guideline addressing these specific services.
- 6. Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1, effective May 16, 2002, 27 TexReg 4047, requires that "Reimbursement for services not identified in an established fee guideline shall be reimbursed at fair and reasonable rates as described in the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, §413.011 until such period that specific fee guidelines are established by the commission."
- 7. Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) requires that fee guidelines must be fair and reasonable and designed to ensure the quality of medical care and to achieve effective medical cost control. The guidelines may not provide for payment of a fee in excess of the fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living and paid by that individual or by someone acting on that individual's behalf. It further requires that the Division consider the increased security of payment afforded by the Act in establishing the fee guidelines.
- 8. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(e)(2)(B), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires that the request shall include "a copy of each explanation of benefits (EOB)... relevant to the fee dispute or, if no EOB was received, convincing evidence of carrier receipt of the provider request for an EOB." Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the request does not include a copy of the EOB detailing the carrier response to the request for reconsideration, nor a copy of any EOBs detailing the carrier response to the initial billing for disputed dates of services 10/30/2005 and 10/31/2005. Neither has the requestor submitted convincing evidence of carrier receipt of the provider request for an EOB. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(e)(1)(B).
- 9. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(A), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including "documentation of the request for and response to reconsideration (when a provider is requesting dispute resolution on a carrier reduction or denial of a medical bill) or, if the carrier failed to respond to the request for reconsideration, convincing evidence of the carrier's receipt of that request." Review of the submitted evidence finds that the requestor has not provided documentation of the insurance carrier's response to the request for reconsideration or convincing evidence of the carrier's receipt of that request. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(A).
- 10. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(B), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including "a copy of any pertinent medical records." Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not provided medical records to support the services in dispute. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(B).
- 11. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(i), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include "a description of the healthcare for which payment is in dispute." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor did not provide a description of the healthcare for which payment is in dispute. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(i).
- 12. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iii), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include "how the Texas Labor Code and commission [now the Division] rules, and fee guidelines, impact the disputed fee issues." Review of the submitted documentation finds that

the requestor did not state how the Texas Labor Code and Division rules impact the disputed fee issues. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iii).

- 13. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iv), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include "how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor did not state how the submitted documentation supports the requestor's position for each disputed fee issue. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iv).
- 14. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(D), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to provide "documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement." Review of the submitted documentation finds that:
 - The requestor does not discuss or explain how payment of \$3049.22 would result in a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services in dispute.
 - The requestor has not articulated a methodology under which fair and reasonable reimbursement should be calculated.
 - Review of the requestor's *Table of Disputed Services* and the medical bills, indicates that the amount in dispute is the same as the amount billed for the disputed services. However, the Division has previously found that a reimbursement methodology based upon payment of a hospital's billed charges, or a percentage of billed charges, does not produce an acceptable payment amount. This methodology was considered and rejected by the Division in the *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline* adoption preamble which states at 22 Texas Register 6276 (July 4, 1997) that:

"A discount from billed charges was another method of reimbursement which was considered. Again, this method was found unacceptable because it leaves the ultimate reimbursement in the control of the hospital, thus defeating the statutory objective of effective cost control and the statutory standard not to pay more than for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living. It also provides no incentive to contain medical costs, would be administratively burdensome for the Commission and system participants, and would require additional Commission resources."

- The requestor did not submit documentation to support that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement.
- The requestor does not discuss or explain how payment of the requested amount would ensure the quality of
 medical care, achieve effective medical cost control, provide for payment that is not in excess of a fee charged for
 similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living, consider the increased security of
 payment, or otherwise satisfy the requirements of Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) or Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1.

The request for additional reimbursement is not supported. Thorough review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not demonstrated or justified that payment of the amount sought would be a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in dispute. Additional payment cannot be recommended.

15. The Division would like to emphasize that individual medical fee dispute outcomes rely upon the evidence presented by the requestor and respondent during dispute resolution, and the thorough review and consideration of that evidence. After thorough review and consideration of all the evidence presented by the parties to this dispute, it is determined that the submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The Division concludes that the requestor failed to support its position that a claim for payment for the disputed services was timely submitted to the insurance carrier in accordance with Texas Labor Code §408.027. Additionally, the Division concludes that this dispute was not filed in the form and manner prescribed under Division rules at 28 Texas Administrative Code sections §133.307(e)(2)(B), §133.307(g)(3)(A), §133.307(g)(3)(B), §133.307(g)(3)(C), and §133.307(g)(3)(D). The Division further concludes that the requestor failed to meet its burden of proof to support its position that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$0.00.

PART VI: GENERAL PAYMENT POLICIES/REFERENCES

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the requestor is not entitled to reimbursement for the services involved in this dispute.
DECISION:

Grayson Richardson

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer

5/28/2010

Date

Authorized Signature PART VIII: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST AN APPEAL

PART VII: DIVISION DECISION

Either party to this medical fee dispute has a right to request an appeal. A request for hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **20** (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. **Please include a copy of the Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision** together with other required information specified in Division rule at 28 TAC §148.3(c).

Under Texas Labor Code §413.0311, your appeal will be handled by a Division hearing under Title 28 Texas Administrative Code Chapter 142 Rules if the total amount sought does not exceed \$2,000. If the total amount sought exceeds \$2,000, a hearing will be conducted by the State Office of Administrative Hearings under Texas Labor Code §413.031.

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.